



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

The comparison of the massacre at Yangchowfu, in 1645, where a whole population was slaughtered, with the massacre of the Manchu garrison community at Sianfu, involving at most fifteen thousand persons, is not sound historically and conveys a wrong impression as to the conduct of the recent revolution.

Considering the title of the book, the animadversions with regard to Young China—which we must attribute to Mr. Bland—are scarcely in order. They involve, too, inconsistencies (compare pp. 15-16 with pp. 519-520). We are familiar with Mr. Bland's pessimism, but we are hardly prepared for such contempt for perspective as appears in the assertion, "The Government which Yuan Shih-K'ai is administering at Peking at this moment is no more republican than was that of Kublai Khan" (p. 518).

Mr. Backhouse is a sinologue of acknowledged authority. Mr. Bland is one of the most entertaining of publicists. Each has his opinions. It is well known in China that these do not always coincide. However we may agree or disagree with the opinions for which they become jointly responsible, what they furnish as history is most useful and their comments command attention and interest. The present work is not on the whole as consistent or convincing as was their *China under the Empress Dowager*. While it would be quite as useful and more satisfactory if some of its pages had been omitted, it will not irritate as did Mr. Bland's *Recent Events and Present Policies*. It constitutes a very valuable contribution to our literature concerning China.

STANLEY K. HORNBECK.

American and English Studies. By WHITELAW REID. In two volumes. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1913. Pp. xi, 316; 344.)

IN 1856, though then too young to vote, Whitelaw Reid took the stump for Frémont. From that time until his death nearly sixty years later at the post of ambassador to Great Britain, he was almost constantly in close contact with public affairs and alert and skillful both in the interpretation and in the evoking and shaping of public opinion.

His life-work was that of a journalist. The four studies grouped under the heading, "An Editor's Reflections", have an added interest from the fact that they span nearly thirty years. The first, Journalism as a Career, dates from the year (1872) in which Whitelaw Reid succeeded Horace Greeley as editor-in-chief of the *New York Tribune*. Practical Issues in a Newspaper Office (1879), Recent Changes in the Press (1901), and Journalistic Duties and Opportunities present acute analysis of important aspects of a rapidly changing profession and business enterprise. Of particular interest is his discussion of the thesis: "Not half enough libel suits are brought; and yet most of those that are brought are unjust" (II. 319-327).

The five biographical essays deal with a great variety of subject. The work and influence of Burke, Byron, and Talleyrand are treated with discerning fairness. The studies of two American statesmen were prepared for university assemblies in Great Britain. Mr. Reid's aim was to strip Lincoln's name and fame "from the incongruous and imaginary attributes under which so many eulogists have disguised him". It is a very human picture. Yet he "places far above Bismarck, who created an empire; far above Gambetta, who saved a fallen people; or Mazzini, who helped put a new soul in another . . . the man who saved for liberty and humanity the greatest Republic of modern times". His characterization of Jefferson is less sympathetic, though ungrudging praise is given to some of his services. His faults and inconsistencies are plainly set forth. In the inevitable parallel between the two rivals, Hamilton always appears here to the better advantage. In some instances the reader suspects that isolation from their context has done scant justice to Jefferson's words. The statement that Jefferson "was the author of the doctrine that 'to the victor belong the spoils'" may be challenged.

Current events lend an unexpectedly timely interest to several of these essays. The Home Rule controversy is made more intelligible by the Scot in America and the Ulster Scot. Both the present ambassador to Great Britain and his critics might find profitable reading in the *Diplomatic Point of View*. "No ambassador has the right to carry his politics on the outward voyage beyond Sandy Hook. From that moment he represents the President and the government of the whole American people. . . . The converse ought to be true—there ought to be no politics at home in dealing with the embassy's work." The Monroe Doctrine and the Polk Doctrine is a lucid presentation of the circumstances under which these enunciations of American foreign policy were put forth. Mr. Reid objectifies the discussion by trying to work out an Asiatic or European Monroe Doctrine or Polk Doctrine, and he queries what our feelings might have been, had we been warned off from the Philippines or Liberia. He raises the question whether we have not given to these doctrines a wider extension than logic or the course of events since 1823 would justify, and whether the legitimate sphere of our influence in the countries below the equator might not be "increased rather than diminished by a moderation of our extreme claim to interfere now with any exercise of their own sovereignty as to territory, government, or otherwise, to which their calm judgment of their own best interests may bring them".

GEORGE H. HAYNES.